SALIENT POINTS OF THE CAMPAIGN.

No. 1.

A TRACT ISSUED BY THE

ILL. REPUBLICAN STATE CENTRAL COMMITTEE.

CONTENTS.

CHAPTER I.—Judge Bates' Letter in Support of Lincoln and Hamlin.
CHAPTER II.—The Three National Platforms—Republican, Douglas, and Breckinridge.
CHAPTER III.—The Wicklife (slave code) Resolution adopted by the Douglas Baltimore Convention.
CHAPTER IV.—Herschel V. Johnson's Record.
CHAPTER V.—Squatter Sovereignty and the African Slave Trade.
CHAPTER VI.—What "Popular Sovereignty" has done
CHAPTER VII.—Slavery in New Mexico—Serfdom of White Laborers.
CHAPTER VIII.—Slavery in Nebraska—Ineffectual Effort to Abolish it.
CHAPTER IX.—All votes cast for Douglas are given practically for Breckinridge or Joe Lane.
CHAPTER X.—"The Everlasting Nigger Question."
CHAPTER XI.—Lincoln's and Hamlin's Letters of Acceptance.

CHAPTER I.

JUDGE BATES' LETTER IN SUPPORT OF LINCOLN AND HAMLIN.

ST. LOUIS, June 11, 1860.

O. H. BROWNING, Esq., Quincy, Illinois.

DEAR SIR:—When I received your letter of May 22d, I had no thought that the answer would be so long delayed; but, waiving all excuses, I proceed to answer it now.

Under the circumstances of the case, it ought not to have been doubted that I would give MR. LINCOLN'S nomination a cordial and hearty support. But in declaring my intention to do so, it is due to myself to state some of the facts and reasons, which have a controlling influence over my mind, and which I think ought to be persuasive arguments with some other men, whose political opinions and antecedents are, in some important particulars, like my own.

There was no good ground for supposing that I felt any pique or dissatisfaction because the Chicago Convention failed to nominate me. I had no such feeling. On party [illegible] I had no right to expect the nomination, had no claims upon the Republicans as [illegible] for I have never been a member of any [illegible] so as to be bound by its dogmas and subject to its discipline, except only the Whig party, which is now broken up and its materials, for the most part, absorbed into other organizations. And thus I am left, alone and powerless indeed, but perfectly free to follow the dictates of my own judgment and to take such part in current politics as my own sense of duty and patriotism may require. Many Republicans, and among them, I think, some of the most moderate and patriotic of that party, honored me with their confidence, and desired to make me their candidate. For this favor I was indebted to the fact that between them and me there was a coincidence of opinion upon certain important questions of government. They and I agreed in believing that the national government has sovereign power over the Territories, and that it would be impolitic and unwise to use that power for the propagation of negro slavery, by planting it in free territory. Some of them believed also, that my nomination, while it would tend to soften the tone of the Republican party, without any abandonment of its principles, might tend also to generalize its character and attract the friendship and support of many, especially in the border States, who, like me, had never been members of their party, but concurred with them in opinion about the government of the Territories. Those are the grounds, and I think the only grounds, upon which I was supported at all at Chicago.

As to the platform put forth by the Chicago Convention, I have little to say, because whether good or bad, that will not constitute the ground of my support of MR. LINCOLN. I have no great respect for party platforms in general. They are commonly made in times of high excitement, under a pressure of circumstances, and with the view to conciliate present support, rather than to establish a permanent system of principles and line of policy for the future good government of the country. The conventions which form them are transient in their nature; their power and influence are consumed in the using, leaving no continuing obligation upon their respective parties. And hence we need not wonder that platforms so made, are hardly ever acted out in practice. I shall not discuss their relative merits, but content myself with saying that this Republican Platform, though in several particulars it does not conform to my views, is still far better than any published creed, past or present, of the Democrats. And as to the new party, it has not chosen to promulgate any platform at all, except two or three broad generalities which are common to the professions of faith of all parties in the country. No party, indeed, dare ask the confidence of the nation, while openly denying the obligation to support the Union and the Constitution, and to enforce the laws. That is a common duty, binding upon every citizen, and the failure to perform it is a crime.

To me it is plain that the approaching contest must be between the Democratic and Re-

publican parties; and, between them, I prefer the latter.

The Democratic party, by the long possession and abuse of power, has grown wanton and reckless; has corrupted itself and perverted the principles of the Government; has set itself openly against the great home interests of the people, by neglecting to protect their industry, and by refusing to improve and keep in order the highways and depots of commerce; and even now is urging a measure in Congress to abdicate the constitutional power and duty to regulate commerce among the States, and to grant to the States the discretionary power to levy tonnage duties upon all our commerce, under the pretence of improving harbors, rivers and lakes; has changed the status of the negro slave by making him no longer mere property, but a politician—an antagonist power in the State; a power to which all other powers are required to yield, under penalty of a dissolution of the Union; has directed its energies to a gratification of its lusts of foreign domain, as manifested in its persistent efforts to seize upon tropical regions, not because those countries and their incongruous people are necessary, or even desirable, to be incorporated into our nation, but for the mere purpose of making slave States, in order to advance the political power of the party in the Senate and in the choice of the President, so as effectually to transfer the chief powers of the government from the many to the few; has in various instances endangered the equality of the co-ordinate branches of the government, by urgent efforts to enlarge the powers of the Executive at the expense of the legislative department; has attempted to discredit and degrade the Judiciary, by affecting to make it, at first, the arbiter of party quarrels, *to become soon and inevitably the passive registrar of party decrees.*

In most if not all these particulars, I understand the Republican party (judging it by its acts and by the known opinions of many of its leading men) to be the exact opposite of the Democratic party; and that is the ground of my preference of the one party over the other. And that alone would be a sufficient reason, if I had no other good reason, for supporting Mr. LINCOLN against any man who may be put forward by the Democratic party as the exponent of its principles and the agent to work out, in practice, its dangerous politics.

The third party, which, by its very formation, has destroyed the organization of the American and Whig parties, has nominated two most excellent men. I know them well, as sound statesmen and true patriots. More than thirty years ago I served with them both in Congress, and from that time to this I have always held them in respect and honor. But what can the third party do towards the election of even such worthy men as these against the two great parties which are now in actual contest for the power to rule the nation? It is made up entirely of portions of the disintegrated elements of the late Whig and American parties—good materials, in the main, I admit, but quite too weak to elect any man or establish any principle. The most it can do is, here and there in particular localities, to make a division in favor of the Democrats. In 1856, the Whig and American parties (not forming a new party but united as allies), with entire unanimity and some zeal, supported Mr. Fillmore for the Presidency, and with what results? We made a miserable failure, carrying no State but gallant little Maryland. And surely, the united Whigs and Americans of that day had a far greater show of strength, and far better prospects of success than any which belong to the Constitutional Union party now. In fact, I see no possibility of success for the third party, except in one contingency: the destruction of the Democratic party. That is a contingency not likely to happen this year, for, badly as I think of many of the acts and policies of that party, its cup is not yet full—the day has not yet come when it must dissolve in its own corruptions; but the day is coming, and is not far off. The party has made itself entirely sectional; it has concentrated its very being into one single idea: *negro slavery has control of all its faculties, and it can see and hear nothing else*—" one stern, tyrannic thought, that makes all other thoughts its slaves!"

But the Democratic party still lives; and while it lives, it and the Republican party are the only real antagonistic powers in the nation, and for the present I must choose between them. I choose the latter, as wiser, purer, younger, and less corrupted by time and self-indulgence.

The candidates nominated at Chicago are both men who, as individuals and politicians, rank with the formost of the country. I have heard no objection to Mr. Hamlin, personally, but only to his geographical position, which [illegible]ht by some to be too far North and allow his personal good qualities to their proper influence over the nation. But the nomination for the Presi- is the great controlling act. Mr. LINCOLN, his character, talents, opinions and history, will be criticised by thousands, while the candidate for the Vice Presidency will be passed over in comparative silence.

Mr. LINCOLN's nomination took the public by surprise, because, until just before the event, it was unexpected. But really it ought not to have excited any surprise, for such unforeseen nominations are common in our political history. Polk and Pierce by the Democrats, and Harrison and Taylor by the Whigs, were all nominated in this extemporaneous manner—all of them were elected. I have known Mr. LINCOLN for more than twenty years, and therefore have a right to speak of him with some confidence. As an individual he has earned a high reputation for truth, courage, candor, morals and amiability, so that, as a man, he is most trustworthy. And in this particular, he is more entitled to our esteem than some other men, his equals who had far better

opportunities and aids in early life. His talents and the will to use them to the best advantage, are unquestionable; and the proof is found in the fact that in every position in life, from his humble beginning to his present well-earned elevation, he has more than fulfilled the best hopes of his friends. And now, in the full vigor of his manhood, and in the honest pride of making himself what he is, he is the peer of the first men of the nation, well able to sustain himself and advance his cause against any adversary, and in any field where mind and knowledge are the weapons used.

In politics he has but acted out the principles of his own moral and intellectual character. He has not concealed his thoughts nor hidden his light under a bushel. With the boldness of conscious rectitude, and frankness of down-right honesty, he has not failed to avow his opinions of public affairs upon all fitting occasions.

This I know may subject him to the carping censure of that class of politicians who mistake cunning for wisdom and falsehood for ingenuity; but such men as LINCOLN must act in keeping with their own characters, and hope for success only by advancing the truth prudently and maintaining it bravely. All his old political antecedents are, in my judgement, exactly right, being square up to the old Whig standard. And as to his views about "the pestilent negro question," I am not aware that he has gone one step beyond the doctrine publicly and habitually avowed by the great lights of the Whig party, Clay, Webster, and their fellows, and, indeed, sustained and carried out by the Democrats themselves, in their wiser and better days.

The following, I suppose, are in brief his opinions upon that subject: 1. Slavery is a domestic institution within the States which choose to have it, and exists within those States beyond the control of Congress. Congress has supreme legislative power over all the Territories, and may, at its discretion, allow or forbid the existence of slavery in them. 3. Congress, in wisdom and sound policy, ought not so to exercise its power, *directly or indirectly*, as to plant and establish slavery in any Territory heretofore free. 4. And that it is unwise and impolitic in the government of the United States to acquire tropical regions for the mere purpose of converting them into slave States.

These, I believe, are Mr. LINCOLN'S opinions upon the matter of slavery in the Territories, and I concur in them. They are no new inventions, made to suite the exigencies of the hour, but have come down to us, as the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution have, sanctioned by the venerable authority of the wise and good men who established our institutions. They are comformable to law, principle and wise policy, and their utility is proven in practice by the as yet unbroken current of our political history. They will prevail, not only because they are right in themselves, but also because a great and growing majority of the people believe them to be right, and the sooner they are allowed to prevail in peace and harmony, the better for all concerned, as well those who are against them as those who are for them.

I am aware that small partisans, in their little warfare against opposing leaders, do sometimes assail them by the trick of tearing from their contexts some particular, objectionable phrases, penned, perhaps, in the hurry of composition, or spoken in the heat of oral debate, and holding them up as the leading doctrines of the persons assailed, and drawing from them their own uncharitable inferences. That line of attack betrays a little mind conscious of its weakness, for the falsity of its logic is not more apparent than the injustice of its design. No public man can stand that ordeal, and, however willing men may be to see it applied to their adversaries, all flinch from the torture when applied to themselves. In fact, the man who never said a foolish thing, will hardly be able to prove that he ever said many wise ones.

I consider Mr. LINCOLN *a sound, safe, national man.* He could not be sectional if he tried. His birth, his education, the habits of his life, and his geographical position, compel him to be national. All his feelings and interests are identified with the great valley of the Mississippi, near whose center he has spent his whole life. That Valley is not a section, but, conspicuously, the body of the nation, and, large as it is, it is not capable of being divided into sections, for the great river cannot be divided. It is one and indivisible, and the North and the South are alike necessary to its comfort and prosperity. Its people, too, in all their interests and affections, are as broad and general as the regions they inhabit. They are emigrants—a mixed multitude—coming from every State in the Union, and from most countries in Europe; they are unwilling, therefore, to submit to any one petty local standard. They love the nation as a whole, and they love all its parts, for they are bound to them all, not only by a feeling of common interest and mutual dependence, but also by the recollections of childhood and youth, by blood and friendship, and by all those social and domestic charities which sweeten life, and make this world worth living in. The Valley is beginning to feel its power, and will soon be strong enough to dictate the law of the land. Whenever that state of things shall come to pass, it will be most fortunate for the nation to find the powers of government lodged in the hands of men whose habits of thought, whose position and surrounding circumstances constrain them to use those powers for general and not sectional ends.

I give my opinion freely in favor of Mr. LINCOLN, and hope that, for the good of the whole country, he may be elected. But it is not my intention to take any active part in the canvass. For many years past I have had little to do with public affairs, and have as-

pired to no political office; and now, in view of the mad excitement which convulses the country, and the general disruption and disorder of parties and the elements which compose them, I am more than ever assured that for me, personally, there is no political future, and I accept the condition with cheerful satisfaction. Still, I cannot discharge myself from the life-long duty to watch the conduct of men in power, and to resist, so far as a mere private man may, the fearful progress of official corruption, which for several years past, has sadly marred and defiled the fair fabric of our government.

If Mr. LINCOLN should be elected, coming in as a new man, at the head of a young party, never before in power, he may render a great service to his country, which no Democrat could render. He can march straight forward in the discharge of his high duties, guided only by his own good judgment and honest purposes, without any necessity to temporize with established abuses, to wink at the delinquencies of old party friends, or to unlearn and discard the bad official habits that have grown up under the misgovernment of his Democratic predecessors. In short, he can be an honest and bold reformer on easier and cheaper terms than any Democratic President can be, for, in proceeding in the good work of cleaning and purifying the administrative departments, he will have no occasion to expose the vices, assail the interests, or thwart the ambition of his political friends.

Begging your pardon for the length of this letter, I remain, with the greatest respect,

Your friend and obedient servant,

EDWARD BATES.

CHAPTER II.

THE THREE PLATFORMS.

NATIONAL REPUBLICAN PLATFORM, ADOPTED BY THE CHICAGO CONVENTION, MAY 17, 1860.

Resolved, That we, the delegated representatives of the Republican electors of the United States, in Convention assembled, in discharge of the duty we owe to our constituents and our country, unite in the following declarations:

The Republican Party.

1. That the history of the nation during the last four years, has fully established the propriety and necessity of the organization and perpetuation of the Republican party, and that the causes which called it into existence are permanent in their nature, and now, more than ever before, demand its peaceful and constitutional triumph.

Its Fundamental Principles.

2. That the maintenance of the principles promulgated in the Declaration of Independence and embodied in the Federal Constitution, "That all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness; that to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men, deriving their just power from the consent of the governed"—is essential to the preservation of our Republican institutions; and that the Federal Constitution, the Rights of the States, and the Union of the States, must and shall be preserved.

True to the Union.

3. That to the Union of the States, this nation owes its unprecedented increase of population; its surprising development of material resources; its rapid augmentation of wealth; its happiness at home and its honor abroad: and we hold in abhorrence all schemes for Disunion, come from whatever source they may. And we congratulate the country that no Republican member of Congress has uttered or countenanced the threats of Disunion so often made by Democratic members, without rebuke and with applause from their political associates; and we denounce those threats of [illegible]ion, in case of a popular overthrow [illegible]endancy, as denying the vital prin[illegible] free government, and as an avowal [illegible]plated treason, which it is the im[illegible]ve duty of an indignant people sternly to rebuke and forever silence.

State Sovereignty.

4. That the maintenance, inviolate, of the Rights of the States, and especially the right of each State to order and control its own domestic institutions according to its own judgment exclusively, is essential to that balance of power on which the perfection and endurance of our political fabric depends; and we denounce the lawless invasion by armed force, of the soil of any State or Territory, no matter under what pretext, as among the gravest of crimes.

Sectionalism of the Democracy.

5. That the present Democratic Administration has far exceeded our worst apprehensions, in its measureless subserviency to the exactions of a sectional interest, as especially evinced in its desperate exertions to force the infamous Lecompton Constitution upon the

protesting people of Kansas; in construing the personal relation between master and servant to involve an unqualified property in persons; in its attempted enforcement everywhere, on land and sea, through the intervention of Congress and of the Federal Courts, of the extreme pretensions of a purely local interest; and in its general and unvarying abuse of power entrusted to it by a confiding people.

Its Extravagance and Corruption.

6. That the people justly view with alarm the reckless extravagance which pervades every department of the Federal Government; that a return to rigid economy and accountability is indispensable to arrest the systematic plunder of the public treasury by favored partisans; while the recent startling developments of frauds and corruptions at the Federal Metropolis, show that an entire change of administration is imperatively demanded.

A Dangerous Political Heresy.

7. That the new dogma that the Constitution, of its own force, carries Slavery into any or all of the Territories of the United States, is a dangerous political heresy, at variance with the explicit provisions of that instrument itself, with cotemporaneous exposition, and with legislative and judicial precedent; is revolutionary in its tendency, and subversive of the peace and harmony of the country.

Freedom, the Normal Condition of Territories.

8. That the normal condition of all the territory of the United States is that of Freedom: That as our Republican fathers, when they had abolished slavery in all our national territory, ordained that "no person should be deprived of life, liberty or property, without due process of law," it becomes our duty, by legislation, whenever such legislation is necessary, to maintain this provision of the Constitution against all attempts to violate it; and we deny the authority of Congress, of a territorial legislature, or of any individuals, to give legal existence to slavery in any territory in the United States.

The African Slave Trade.

9. That we brand the recent re-opening of the African Slave Trade, under the cover of our national flag, aided by perversions of judicial power, as a crime against humanity, and a burning shame to our country and age; and we call upon Congress to take prompt and efficient measures for the total and final suppression of that execrable traffic.

Democratic Popular Sovereignty.

10. That in the recent vetoes, by their Federal Governors, of the acts of the legislatures of Kansas and Nebraska, prohibiting Slavery in those Territories, we find a practical illustration of the boasted Democratic principle of Non-Intervention and Popular Sovereignty embodied in the Kansas-Nebraska Bill, and a demonstration of the deception and fraud involved therein.

Admission of Kansas.

11. That Kansas should, of right, be immediately admitted as a State under the Constitution recently formed and adopted by her people, and accepted by the House of Representatives.

Encouragement of American Industry.

12. That, while providing revenue for the support of the general government by duties upon imports, sound policy requires such an adjustment of these imports as to encourage the development of the industrial interests of the whole country; and we commend that policy of national exchanges, which secures to the working men liberal wages; to agriculture, remunerating prices; to mechanics and manufacturers, an adequate reward for their skill, labor and enterprise; and to the nation, commercial prosperity and independence.

Free Homesteads.

13. That we protest against any sale or alienation to others of the Public Lands held by actual settlers, and against any view of the Free Homestead policy which regards the settlers as paupers or suppliants for public bounty; and we demand the passage by Congress of the complete and satisfactory Homestead Measure which has already passed the House.

Rights of Citizenship.

14. That the Republican party is opposed to any change in our Naturalization Laws or any State Legislation by which the rights of citizenship hitherto accorded to emigrants from foreign lands shall be abridged or impaired; and in favor of giving a full and efficient protection to the rights of all classes of citizens, whether native or naturalized, both at home and abroad.

River and Harbor Improvements.

15. The appropriations by Congress for River and Harbor improvements of a National character, required for the accommodation and security of an existing commerce, are authorized by the Constitution, and justified by the obligation of Government to protect the lives and property of its citizens.

A Pacific Railroad.

16. That a Railroad to the Pacific Ocean is imperatively demanded by the interests of the whole country; that the Federal Government ought to render immediate and efficient aid in its construction; and that, as preliminary thereto, a daily Overland Mail should be promptly established.

Co-operation Invited.

17. Finally, having thus set forth our distinctive principles and views, we invite the co-operation of all citizens, however differing on other questions, who substantially agree with us in their affirmance and support.

PLATFORM OF THE DOUGLAS FACTION OF THE DEMOCRACY, ADOPTED AT BALTIMORE, JUNE 23, 1860.

Resolved, That we, the Democracy of the Union, in Convention assembled, hereby declare our affirmation of the resolutions unanimously adopted and declared as a platform of principles by the Democratic Convention at Cincinnati, in the year 1856, believing that Democratic principles are unchangable in their nature when applied to the same subject matter.

Resolved, That it is the duty of the United States to afford ample and complete protection to all its citizens, at home or abroad, and whether native or foreign born.

Resolved, That one of the necessities of the age, in a military, commercial and postal point of view, is speedy communication between the Atlantic and Pacific States, and the Democratic party pledge such constitutional enactment as will insure the construction of a railroad to the Pacific coast at the earliest practicable period.

Resolved, That the Democratic party are in favor of the acquisition of the Island of Cuba, on such terms as shall be honorable to ourselves and just to Spain.

Resolved, That the enactments of State Legislatures to defeat the faithful execution of the Fugitive Slave law are hostile in character, subversive of the Constitution and revolutionary in their effect.

Resolved, That it is in accordance with the Cincinnati Platform, that during the existence of Territorial Governments the measure of restriction, whatever it may be, imposed by the Federal Constitution on the power of the Territorial Legislature over the subject of the domestic relations, *as the same has been or shall hereafter be decided by the Supreme Court of the United States*, should be respected by all good citizens, and enforced with promptness and fidelity *by every branch of the General Government*.

PLATFORM OF THE BRECKINRIDGE FACTION OF THE DEMOCRACY, ADOPLED AT BALTIMORE, JU E 23, 1860.

Resolved, That the platform adopted by the Democratic party at Cincinnati be affirmed, with the following explanatory resolutions:

1. That the government of the Territory organized by an act of Congress is provisional and temporary, and during its existence all citizens of the United States have an equal right to settle with their property in the Territory, without their rights, either of person or property, being destroyed or injured by Congressional or Territorial legislation.

2. That it is the duty of the Federal Government, in all its departments, to protect the rights of persons and property in the Territories, and wherever else its constitutional authority extends.

3. That when the settlers in a Territory having an adequate population to form a State constitution, the right of sovereignty commences, and being consummated by their admission into the Union, they stand on an equality with the people of other States, and a State thus organized ought to be admitted into the Federal Union, whether its constitution prohibits or recognises the institution of slavery.

Resolved, That the Democratic party are in favor of the acquisition of the Island of Cuba, on such terms as shall be honorable to ourselves and just to Spain, at the earliest practicable moment.

Resolved, That the enactments of State Legislatures to defeat the faithful execution of the Fugitive Slave law are hostile in character, subversive of the Constitution, and revolutionary in their effect.

Resolved, That the Democracy of the United States recognize it as the imperative duty of this government to protect the naturalized citizen in all his rights, whether at home or in foreign lands, to the same extent as its native born citizens.

WHEREAS, One of the greatest necessities of the age, in a political, commercial, postal and mil[illegible]y point of view, is a speedy communication between the Pacific and Atlantic coasts, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the National Democratic party do hereby pledge themselves to use every means in their power to secure the passage of some bill, to the extent of their constitutional authority, by Congress, for the construction of a Pacific Railroad from the Mississippi River to the Pacific Ocean, at the earliest practicable moment.

CHAPTER III.

THE WICKLIFFE RESOLUTION.

The concluding resolution of the Douglas Platform should be carefully examined by every voter in the North. It was offered just after Mr. Douglas was declared nominated, by Mr. Wickliffe, of Louisiana, who stated in open Convention, that its adoption "would give Douglas 40,000 votes in Louisiana." Whereupon, on motion of Mr. Payne, of Ohio, it was *adopted unanimously* in the following words:

"*Resolved*. That it is in accordance with the Cincinnati platform, that during the existence of Territorial Governments, the measure of restriction, whatever it may be, imposed by the Federal Constitution on the power of the Territorial Legislature over the subject of the domestic relations, *as the same has been or shall hereafter be decided by the Supreme Court of the United States*, should be respected by all good citizens, and enforced with promptness and fidelity *by every branch of the General Government*."

The question naturally and properly arises, *What does this resolution mean?* Why was it adopted? If it means nothing, why is it there? If it means something, what is that something? It was avowedly introduced to give Douglas 40,000 votes in Louisiana! At Freeport Mr. Douglas said: "It matters not what way the Supreme Court may hereafter decide as to the abstract question whether slavery may or may not go into a Territory under the Constitution, the people have the lawful means to introduce or to exclude it as they please." But now his platform says that, as the aforesaid question has been or may hereafter be decided by the Supreme Court, it should be "enforced with promptness and fidelity *by every branch of the general government!*" Is not Congress one branch of the general government; and if the Supreme Court has already, or shall hereafter, decide that Territorial Legislatures cannot exclude slavery, or that slaves, being property under the Constitution, may be held as such in the Territories, is not the Douglas party, as well as the Breckinridge party, committed *to a Congressional slave code?* It happens that the whole quarrel in the Democratic ranks, so far as any principle is involved in it, has grown out of the fact that the Supreme Court *have already decided the question*. In the Dred Scott case, the Court, after deciding that Congress had no power to prohibit slavery in a Territory, proceeded as follows:

"The powers over person and property of which we speak are not only not granted to Congress, but are in express terms denied, and they are forbidden to exercise them. And this prohibition is not confined to the States, but the words are general, and extend to the whole territory over which the Constitution gives it power to legislate, including those portions of it remaining under Territorial Government, as well as that covered by States. It is a total absence of power everywhere within the dominion of the United States, and places the citizens of a Territory, so far as these rights are concerned, on the same footing with citizens of the States, and guards them as firmly and plainly against any inroads which the General Government might attempt, under the plea of implied or incidental powers. And if Congress itself cannot do this—if it is beyond the powers conferred on the Federal Government—*it will be admitted, we presume, that it could not authorize a Territorial Government to exercise them. It could confer no power on any local government established by its authority, to violate the provisions of the Constitution.*

"It seems, however, to be supposed that there is a difference between property in a slave and other property, and that different rules may be applied to it in expounding the Constitution of the United States. And the laws and usages of nations, and the writings of eminent jurists upon the relation of master and slave, and their mutual rights and duties, and the powers which governments may exercise over it, have been dwelt upon in the argument.

"But in considering the question before us, it must be borne in mind that there is no law of nations standing between the people of the United States and their government, and interfering with their relation to each other. The powers of the government, and the rights of the citizen under it, are positive and practical regulations plainly written down. The people of the United States have delegated to it certain enumerated powers, and forbidden it to exercise others. It has no power over the person or property of a citizen but what the citizens of the United States have granted. And no laws or usages of other nations, or reasoning of statesmen or jurists upon the relation of master and slave, can enlarge the powers of the government, or take from the citizens the rights they have reserved. And if the Constitution recognizes the right of property of the master in a slave, and makes no distinction between that description of property and other property owned by a citizen, *no tribunal, acting under the authority of the United States, whether it be legislative, executive or judicial, has a right to draw such a distinction, or deny to it the benefit of the provisions and guarantees which have been provided for the protection of private property against the encroachments of the government.*

"Now, as we have already said in an earlier part of this opinion, upon a different point, *the right of property in a slave is distinctly and expressly affirmed in the Constitution.* The right to traffic in it, like an ordinary article of merchandise and property, was guaranteed to the citizens of the United States in every State that might desire it, for twenty years. And the Government in express terms is pledged to protect it in all future time, if the slave escapes from his owner. This is done in plain words, too plain to be misunderstood. And no word can be found in the Constitution which gives Congress a greater power over slave property, or which entitles property of that kind to less protection than property of any other description. *The only power conferred is the power, coupled with the duty, of guarding and protecting the owner in his rights.*"

Now here is a plain logical proposition, which no man can fail to understand: 1. The Supreme Court have decided that neither Congress nor a Territorial Legislature can prohibit slavery in a Territory; 2. The Douglas platform says that the opinion of the Court on this point "as it has been or shall hereafter be decided," must be enforced "by every branch of the general government;" 3. Therefore Congress, as a branch of the general government, should enforce the doctrine that a Territorial Legislature cannot exclude slavery, by promptly repealing every law which may be enacted prohibiting slavery. If any one is so purblind as not to see that the Supreme Court have already decided the question adversely to "squatter sovereignty," let him read the above quotation from the Dred Scott decision, and ask himself what the Court will *hereafter* decide when the question shall come distinctly before them. The Wickliffe resolution is worded to accommodate both those who believe that the question has been already decided and those who believe it is "hereafter" to be decided. If it be admitted that the question is not yet decided, *how will it be decided* when it comes up again? Let the fair minded reader scan the decision *which has been made*, and frame the answer for himself. It is submitted to all candid persons that the Wickliffe resolution was adopted for the purpose of cheating somebody. If it is to be carried out in good faith to Mr. Wikeliffe and his friends in Louisiana, its obvious purpose is to cheat the Democracy of Illinois. If it is to be nullified after the campaign is over, of course Wickliffe & Co., are to be cheated in like manner. Fraud is stamped upon every letter of it. But Wickliffe & Co., have taken good care that *they*

shall not be cheated. They have got their resolution *into the platform*, and they have got the Dred Scott decision behind it. They know, if there is a controversy in the party as to what the Court did actually decide, the Court will "hereafter" decide in their favor. Who then is to be cheated? Douglas Democrat of the North, it is *you!* Some of your leaders are honest enough to admit that the Supreme Court have really decided against you. JOHN W. FORNEY, of Pennsylvania, is one of these. In an "address to the People of Pennsylvania," published July 11, 1859, signed "John W. Forney, Chairman, Democratic State Rights Committee," he says:

"It will be observed that when Mr. Buchanan wrote, and when Mr. Cobb spoke, and when the entire Democratic party stood squarely united upon the honest construction of the Kansas-Nebraska bill, the odious theory advanced by this Pennsylvania National Democratic committee was not a novelty, nor was the subsequent *obiter dictum, as it is, of the Supreme Court, an unanticipated event.* But it was notorious that every conservative, Union-loving statesman in Congress, from Henry Clay, in the South, to Lewis Cass, in the North, had denounced the idea of an Executive or Congressional protection for the Territories, on the subject of slavery, as unworthy of the consideration of a free country, and that more than one eminent Southern leader had declared *that the political opinion of no court, high or low, could be wielded against the sacred and inalienable franchises of the people*, when they came to exercise their highest acts of sovereignty in regard to this very question of slavery."

Is it not a plain and palpable inference from this language, that Col. Forney admits the Southern construction,—the Wickliffe construction—of the Dred Scott decision to be correct, and that he proposes to repudiate it as the only proper way to save "popular sovereignty"? He calls it an *obiter dictum* —a "decision out of the way," that is, a declaration of law apart from the case before the Court, and therefore having no binding force. But Mr. Douglas does not consider it an *obiter dictum*. He says:

"The Court did not attempt to avoid responsibility by disposing of the case upon technical points without touching the merits, nor did they go out of their way to decide questions not properly before them and directly presented by the record. *Like honest and conscientious judges, as they are*, they met and decided each point as it arose, and faithfully performed their whole duty and nothing but their duty to the country *by determining all the questions in the case*, and nothing but what was essential to the decision of the case upon its merits."—[Douglas' Springfield Grand Jury Speech, June 12th, 1857,—as published in the *State Register*.]

Hence he (Douglas), is bound to construe the decision *as law*, and he is bound by the Platform of his party to frame the territorial policy of the government "as the same has been, *or shall hereafter be*, decided by the Supreme Court." Are there not *two* slave-code parties in the field?

CHAPTER IV.

HERSCHEL V. JOHNSON'S RECORD.

It was fitting that the Douglas Democracy, after putting a slave code plank in their platform, should nominate *the original slave code man of the South*, as their candidate for Vice-President That man is Herschel V. Johnson, of Georgia. The nomination of Fitzpatrick, who voted for the Lecompton bill, in all its stages, and who actually supported Jeff. Davis' slave code resolutions in the Senate, was bad enough; but the nomination of Johnson was, if possible, still worse. For the purpose of showing the Douglas Democracy of the Northwest the sentiments of *their* candidate for the Vice-Presidency, we quote from his speech delivered in the United States Senate, on the 7th of July, 1848, commencing on page 887 of the Appendix to the *Congressional Globe* for that year:

Protection of Slavery in the Territories.

"It remains now to consider the question involved in the amendment proposed by the Senator from Mississippi. [Mr. Davis.] That question is, whether it is *the duty of Congress to guarantee* to the slaveholder who shall remove with his slaves into the territory of the United States *the undisputed enjoyment of his property in them, so long as it continues to be a Territory*. Or, *in other words*, whether the inhabitants of a Territory, *during their territorial condition*, have the right to prohibit slavery therein.

No Power Whatever can Exclude Slavery from the Territories.

"For the purpose of this question, it matters not where the power of legislating for the Territory resides —whether exclusively in Congress, or jointly in Congress and the inhabitants, or exclusively in the inhabitants of the Territory; the power is precisely the same —no greater in the hands of one than the other. *In no event, can the slaveholder of the South be excluded from settling in such Territory* WITH HIS PROPERTY OF EVERY DESCRIPTION.

Squatter Sovereignty Squelched.

"But suppose that Congress have the right to establish a Territorial Government and why, and that then, all further governmental control ceases: can the Territorial Legislature *pass an act prohibiting slavery? Surely not.* For the moment you admit the right to organize a Territorial Government to exist in Congress, you admit necessarily the subordination of the people of the Territory—their dependence on this Government for an organic law, to give them political existence. Hence, all the legislation must be in conformity with the organic law, they can pass no act in violation of it—none but such as it permits. Since, therefore, Congress has no power, as I have shown, to prohibit Slavery, *they cannot delegate such a power to the inhabitants of the Territory;* they cannot authorize the Territorial Legislature to do that which they have no power to do. The stream cannot rise higher than its source.

Absolute Congressional Sovereignty vs. Non-Intervention.

"It is idle, however, to discuss this question in this form. For if Congress possess the power to organize temporary governments, it must then possess the power to legislate for the Territories. If they may perform the greater, they may the less; the major includes the minor proposition. Hence, Congress has, in all cases since the foundation of our government, reserved a veto upon the legislation of the Territorial Governments: *it is absolutely necessary*, in order to restrain them from violations of the Constitution, and infringe-

ments of the rights of the States, as joint owners of the public lands. If, therefore, an act of the Territorial Government, prohibiting Slavery, should be sent up to Congress for approval, *they would be bound to withhold it, upon the ground of its being an act which Congress themselves could not pass.*

The People cannot Exclude Slavery from a Territory.

"But suppose the right of legislation for the Territory he in its inhabitants, can they prohibit Slavery? *Surely not;* and for reasons similar to those which show that Congress cannot.

He demands a Slave Code.

"It is urged that slavery does not exist in New Mexico and California; that they are free Territories; and although we deny to Congress any jurisdiction over the subject, *yet we ask Congress by this amendment to establish slavery therein.* Upon the execution of the treaty, all political regulations of the United States were extended over the Territories, *and the institution of slavery being political in its character, it now exists, in legal intendment, as absolutely in New Mexico and California as it does in Virginia and Georgia.*

Popular Sovereignty is Ridiculous and Absurd.

"If you assert the broad proposition that the inhabitants of the Territory, by *virtue of the right of self-government*, have the right to exclude slavery therein the question arises, how many inhabitants shall there be to enable them to do this? Shall it be five hundred, or ten or twenty thousand? Shall a few thousand people in Oregon—a vast territory out of which five or six States may be carved—determine that question for all future generations, and fix their destiny for all time to come? Shall a few thousand half civilized Mexicans, inhabiting the Territories of California and New Mexico decide what institutions shall exist there? *The idea is ridiculous and absurd.*

"The institution of Slavery is *guaranteed* by the Constitution of the United States, and it has *the same protection* thrown around it, which guards our citizens against the granting of titles of nobility, or the establishment of religion; *therefore Congress would be as much bound* to veto an act of Territorial legislation prohibiting it, as an act violating these rights of every citizen of the Republic.

A Disunion Tirade.

"But suppose, Mr. President, you have the right to prohibit Slavery in the Territories of the United States, what high political consideration requires you to exercise it? All must see, that it cannot be affected without producing a *popular convulsion which will probably dissolve the Union.*"

These were Mr. Johnson's sentiments in 1848. Let us see what they are in 1860. To show that he has not yet changed his mind on the matter in issue between the two wings of the pro-slavery party, we reprint from the *Southerner and Advertiser*, a Douglas paper, published at Rome, Ga., (an authority, therefore, that cannot be disputed,) the proceedings of the Democratic State Convention, held at Milledgeville, June 4th, called to take action in regard to the secession of most of the Georgia delegates at Charleston. It seems that a Business Committee of twenty-four was appointed, of which Herschel V. Johnson was one. This Committee disagreed as to the propriety of appointing new delegates to Baltimore, the friends of the seceders opposing, and a few who preferred to see Douglas elected to a dissolution of the party, favored that step; and the consequence was, that two reports were presented—a majority one by twenty members of the Committee, and a minority one by *four* members, which latter division included Herschel V. Johnson, who, as Chairman, introduced the minority report which was as follows:

"*Resolved*, That we re-affirm the Cincinnati platform, with the following additional propositions:

"1st. That the citizens of the United States have an equal right to settle with *their property of any kind*, in the organized Territories of the United States, and that under the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States in the case of Dred Scott, which we recognize as the correct exposition of the Constitution in this particular, slave property stands on the same footing as all other descriptions of property, and that neither the General Government, NOR ANY TERRITORIAL GOVERNMENT, can destroy or impair the right to slave property; that property of all kinds, slaves as well as any other species of property, in the Territories, stand upon the same equal and broad Constitutional basis, and subject to like principles of recognition and PROTECTION in the LEGISLATIVE, judicial and executive departments of the Government.

"2d. That we will support any man who may be nominated by the Baltimore Convention, for the Presidency, who holds the principles set forth in the foregoing proposition, and who will give them his endorsement, and we will not hold ourselves bound to support any man, who may be the nominee, who entertains principles inconsistent with those set forth in the above propositions, or who denies that slave property in the Territories does stand on an equal footing and on the same Constitutional basis of other descriptions of property.

"In view of the fact that a large majority of the delegates from Georgia felt it to be their duty to withdraw from the late Democratic Convention, thereby depriving this State of her vote therein, according to the decision of said Convention.

"*Resolved*, That this Convention will appoint twenty delegates—four from the State at large, and two from each Congressional District—to represent the Democratic party of Georgia, in the adjourned Convention at Baltimore, on the 18th inst., and that the delegates he and are here by instructed to present the foregoing propositions, and ask their adoption by the National Democratic Convention.

"HERSCHEL V. JOHNSON,
"THOS. P. SAFFORD,
"H. K. MCCAY,
"H. COLYARD."

But this is not all, nor is it the worst. Mr. Johnson believes that capital should own its labor, irrespective of color or condition. In a public speech delivered in Philadelphia on the 15th of September, 1856, he said:

"*We believe that capital should own labor;* is there any doubt that there must be a laboring class everywhere? In all countries and under every form of social organization there must be a laboring class—a class of men who get their living by the sweat of their brow; and then there must he another class that controls and directs the capital of the country."

CHAPTER V.

OPINIONS OF ANOTHER DOUGLAS MAN IN GEORGIA.

This is perhaps as suitable a place as we can find to reprint the sentiments of another Douglas man—Mr. Gaulden, a delegate from Georgia in the Baltimore Convention. Mr. Gaulden was an enthusiastic advocate of "non-intervention" as will be seen from the following remarks which he made in the Convention on the

RE-OPENING OF THE SLAVE TRADE.

"I say I go for non-intervention in the broadest sense of the term. I say that this whole thing should be taken out of the hands of the General Government. I say it is all wrong to be spending two or three millions of dollars annually from our pockets, and sacrificing thousands of lives upon the coast of Africa, in that terrible clime, to prevent our going there to get a few negroes. *If it is right for us to go to Virginia and buy a negro and pay $2,000 for him, it is equally right for us to go to Africa, where we can get them for $50.* [Applause and laughter.] Here is the condition we are placed in, and you may as well come to your senses and face the music.

"There are 2,000 of our negroes now down at Key West, begging and pleading not to be sent back. If they should be sent back, what would be the result? One-half of them would die before they got there, and the other half would be turned upon the coast of Africa—upon the coast of Liberia, among strangers, to be eaten up by the cannibals, or caught and sold again, or die of starvation; and this you call humanity! I say it is piracy; I say that our Government is acting against right and reason in this matter; and if the Southern men had the spunk and spirit to come right up and face the North, I believe the Northern Democracy at least, would come to the true doctrine of popular sovereignty and non-intervention. [Applause and laughter.]

"Think of it: two thousand of these poor barbarians from Africa, caught within the last four weeks, and kept upon the miserable Island of Key West, dying there from disease and starvation; and what do not die are to be sent back! Our Government at an expense of one or two millions, though they are begging not to be sent back, and landed upon the coast of Africa. It is cruel, inhuman, wrong, and I appeal to the good sense of the American nation against it. Look at John Bull; he has bound us to catch all we can, and we send them back at an expense of twenty-five dollars per head. We send them back, but what does John Bull do when he gets them? He apprentices them out again, and makes slaves of them. That is the hypocritical treaty that you are bound by, and yet I hear no Southern voice, or Northern voice, raised against this aggression upon the law of nature and of nature's God, but I intend to raise my voice against it, humble as it is.

"Now, this may be a secondary question before us tonight. The great point is harmony and union in the Democratic party. Let us whip the Black Republicans, let us win the fight, and *when we have settled these things*, let us act together and all will be right."

CHAPTER VI.

WHAT "POPULAR SOVEREIGNTY" HAS DONE.

It will be admitted that Mr. Douglas is a good judge of what his dogma of "Popular Sovereignty" has accomplished during the past six years. Therefore, we let him tell the result in his own words, quoting from his speech in the Senate on the 16th of May, 1860, as printed in the *Congressional Globe*:

"But, we are told that the necessary result of this doctrine of non-intervention, which gentlemen, by way of throwing ridicule upon, call squatter sovereignty, is to deprive the South of all participation in what they call the common Territories of the United States. That was the ground on which the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. Davis) predicated his opposition to the compromise measures of 1850. He regarded a refusal to repeal the Mexican law as equivalent to the Wilmot proviso; a refusal to recognize by an act of Congress the right to carry a slave there as equivalent to the Wilmot proviso; a refusal to deny to a Territorial Legislature the right to exclude slavery as equivalent to an exclusion. He believed at that time that this doctrine did amount to a denial of southern rights, and he told the people of Mississippi so; but they doubted it. Now, let us see how far his predictions and suppositions have been verified. I infer that he told the people so, for as he makes it a charge in his bill of indictment against me, that I am hostile to Southern rights, because I gave those votes.

"Now, what has been the result? My views were incorporated into the compromise measures of 1850, and his were rejected. Has the South been excluded from all the territory acquired from Mexico? What says the bill from the House of Representatives now on your table, repealing the slave code in New Mexico, established by the people themselves? *It is part of the history of the country that under this doctrine of non-intervention, this doctrine that you delight to call squatter sovereignty, the people of New Mexico have introduced and protected slavery in the whole of that Territory. Under this doctrine they have converted a tract of free territory into slave territory more than five times the size of the State of New York. Under this doctrine slavery has been extended from the Rio Grande to the Gulf of California, and from the line of the Republic of Mexico, not only up to 36 deg. 30 min., but up to 38 deg.*—GIVING YOU A DEGREE AND A HALF MORE SLAVE TERRITORY THAN YOU EVER CLAIMED. In 1848 and 1849 and 1850, you only asked to have the line of 36 deg. 30 min. The Nashville Convention fixed that as its ultimatum. I offered it in the Senate in August, 1848, and it was adopted here, but rejected in the House of Representatives. You asked only up to 36 deg. 30 min., *and non-intervention has given you slave territory up to 38 deg.*—A DEGREE AND A HALF MORE THAN YOU ASKED; and yet you say that this is a sacrifice of Southern rights?

"These are the fruits of this principle which the Senator from Mississippi regards as hostile to the rights of the South. Where did you ever get any other fruits that were more palatable to your taste or refreshing to your strength? What other inch of free territory has been converted into slave territory on the American continent, since the Revolution, except in New Mexico and Arizona, under the principle of non-intervention affirmed at Charleston. If it be true that this principle of non-intervention has conferred upon you all that immense territory of slave territory in that comparatively northern and cold region where you did not expect it to go, cannot you trust the same principle further South when you come to acquire additional territory from Mexico, which was surrounded on nearly every side by free territory? will not the same principle protect you in the northern States of Mexico when they are acquired, since they are now surrounded by slave territory; are several hundred miles further South; have many degrees of greater heat; and have a climate and soil adapted to southern products? Are you not satisfied with these practical results?"

CHAPTER VII.

SLAVERY IN NEW MEXICO.—SERFDOM OF WHITE LABORERS.

It is appropriate to inquire in this connection *what kind of slavery* Popular Sovereignty has been instrumental in introducing into New Mexico; "a Territory," as Mr. Douglas says, "more than five times the size of the State of New York." The reader will be surprised to learn that it includes the serfdom of white men as well as the slavery of the blacks, and that it allows any man who employs other men in the capacity of laborers to FLOG, BEAT, CUFF, AND OTHERWISE PUNISH THEM, to his heart's content, irrespective of color or sex, and denies to the party so flogged and beaten *any redress at law!* We copy the following sections from "an act amendatory of the law relative to contracts between masters and servants," passed by the Territorial Legislature of New Mexico, January 26, 1859:

"SEC. 1. When any servant shall run away from the service of his master, he shall be considered as a fugitive from justice, and in such case it shall be the duty of all officers of the Territory, judicial or ministerial, on being informed that such persons are within the limits of their jurisdiction, to ascertain whether such persons are runaway servants or not, and if they ascertain that they are, said officers shall immediately arrest them and put them to work at public labor, or hire them out to any person so that they may be employed, with security, until their master shall be informed thereof, in order that they may demand them, and to whom they shall immediately be delivered.

"SEC. 2. Every person of this Territory, either a contracted servant according to the law of contracts, or engaged on trips or as shepherds, shall be compelled to serve for the time stipulated for in the contract; and any servant so contracted who shall fail to serve by abandoning his master or property placed under his care, shall be held responsible for all costs and damages which through his neglect may result to the owner.

"SEC. 4. *No Court of this Territory shall have jurisdiction to or shall take cognizance of any cause for the correction that masters may give their servants* for neglect of their duties as servants, for they are considered as domestic servants to their masters, *and they should correct their neglect and faults;* for as soldiers are punished by their chiefs, without the intervention of the civil authority, by reason of the salary they enjoy, *an equal right should be granted those persons who pay their money to be served in the protection of their property: Provided*, That such correction shall not be inflicted in a cruel manner with clubs or stripes."

The concluding proviso is similar to that which prevails in all the slave codes of the Southern States—leaving it discretionary with the "master" as to *what constitutes* "correction inflicted in a cruel manner." The slave code of New Mexico, by the terms of Sections 12, 13, 14 and 15, allows *any person* to arrest any one whom he calls an absconding slave, *by force*, and without any legal process from any court or magistrate, and to deliver such person so arrested to the sheriff of the county in which the arrest may be made, which sheriff shall imprison such person for six months, (without a commitment,) and advertise for a master, and if no master come, shall imprison six months longer, and advertise for sale; and at the end of twelve months' imprisonment, the sheriff shall sell such person, at the door of the jail or courthouse, to the highest bidder, for cash, and his *bill of sale* "shall vest in the purchaser a good and indefeasible title against all persons whatever."

On the 16th of February, 1860, the Hon. John A. Bingham, of Ohio, from the House Committee on Territories, reported a bill declaring these infamous acts null and void. A vote was thereupon taken in the House of Representatives, on Mr. Bingham's bill, resulting as follows:

YEAS.		NAYS.	
Republicans	97	Democrats and South Americans	91
Democrats	00	Republicans	00
South Americans	00		

Among the nays were Messrs. John A. Logan, Isaac N. Morris and James C. Robinson, of Illinois, (Messrs. Fouke and McClernand not voting,) Chas. H. Larrabee, of Wisconsin, Geo. B. Cooper, of Michigan, and all the other Democratic members from the Northwest, who thus sanctioned, in express terms, the serfdom or peonage of persons of their own color and kindred, in New Mexico. It was this bill of Mr. Bingham's which Mr. Douglas refers to in the extract from his speech of the 16th of May, quoted above.

CHAPTER VIII.

SLAVERY IN NEBRASKA—INEFFECTUAL EFFORTS TO ABOLISH IT.

It is not deemed necessary to revert to the workings of Popular Sovereignty in Kansas—the violence, rapine and bloodshed which followed the repeal of the Missouri Compromise. These things are too fresh in the recollections of the people. But it is well to call to mind the unavailing efforts of the Republicans in Nebraska, to abolish slavery in that Territory, and the successful exertions of the Democracy to thwart that beneficient purpose. Early in the session of the Nebraska Legislature, last winter, Mr. Dundy, a Republican member of the Council, and Mr. Collier, a Republican member of the House of Representatives, introduced bills in their respective bodies, for the abolition and prohibition of slavery in the Territory. The Omaha *Nebraskian* and the Nebraska City *News*, the Democratic organs of

the Territory, immediately denounced the measure as a wanton agitation of the slavery question, designed to create "political capital." The Chicago *Times* cordially seconded its confederates in Nebraska by reprobating the proposed law, and pronouncing it "a most unnecessary piece of buncombe." The Republican journals and members of the Legislature replied that slavery did exist in the Territory, and urged the Democrats to assist in passing the law as the easiest way to *destroy* all the political capital which might be made out of it by the Republican side. The bills were referred to a select committee of whom a majority were Democrats.

First, an investigation was had into the fact whether slavery did or did not exist in the Territory. The Democratic majority reported that there were "four and a half persons" held in slavery in the Territory, and that it was unwise, unnecessary and inexpedient to pass any law prohibiting the institution. The Republican minority reported that the fact was notorious and indisputable that slaves were held at a number of places in the Territory, and that parties of slave hunters had frequently sallied across the river into Iowa, in pursuit of fugitives from service and labor held in Nebraska. They also recommended the passage of the law abolishing and prohibiting the institution. A vote was taken on the 20th of December, 1859, and the bill was defeated *by the Democrats*. Every Republican in the two houses voted for it, and all but two or three Democrats against it. Thus was "Popular Sovereignty" vindicated!

But this was not all. The bill was resuscitated on a motion to re-consider, and was forced to a second vote on the 3d of January, 1860. It was proposed by both parties to call a convention for the formation of a State Constitution, and some of the Democrats became frightened by the evidences that they would be utterly defeated if they allowed the slavery record to stand against them. Hence, when brought to the scratch a second time the bill passed both houses on the 3d of January, aforesaid, by the following vote:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

AYES—*Bain, Barker, Bowen, Burbank*, Campbell, *Collier*, Crowe, *Davis*, Funscum, Lake, *Latta, Marsette, Maxwell*, Myers, *Rogers*, Reck, *Stephenson*, Stewart, *Taffe*—19.

NAYS—Adams, Arnott, Barnard, Belden, Brodhead, Goshen, Hinsdale, Johnson, Kelling, Kennedy, Malcolm, Noel, Nuckolls of Otoe, Nuckolls of Rich, Reynolds, Shields, Tuft—17.

ABSENT—Bates, McCasland.

IN THE COUNCIL.

AYES—Messrs. Boykin, *Cheever*, Doane, *Dundy*, Furnas, *Porter, Reeves*—7.

NOES—Messrs. Collier, Little and Scott—3.

[Democrats in Roman, Republicans in *Italics*.]

The bill was as follows:

"Sec. 1. Be it enacted by the Council and House of Representatives of the Territory of Nebraska, that slavery or involuntary servitude except for the punishment of crime, be and the same is forever prohibited in this Territory.

"Sec. 2. This act shall take effect and be in force from and after the first day of July, A. D. 1860."

On the occasion of its passage in the Council, Mr. Little, an ardent advocate of popular sovereignty, delivered his views as follows. We quote from the Omaha *Nebraskian*, of January 4th:

"Mr. Little—Mr. President:—I have heretofore been, as I am now, a zealous follower of Stephen A. Douglas, in so far as I have regarded him the leader of the principles of popular sovereignty in the Territories; believing, as I do, that the people have the right to legislate upon this subject, and if necessary, to prevent Southerners from bringing their slaves here among us. But, sir, I shall vote to-day as I have heretofore done, against this, or any similar bill, in whatever shape it may come up, from principles of policy. There is no need of this legislation now. If we could actually see a black cloud rising in the South, and should a horde of slaves be precipitated upon our fair soil to-day, no one would vote quicker than I to repel such an evil from the land. But where is the danger? Where is this dreaded African spectre that, like Hamlet's ghost, flits ever before the hallucinated vision of the supporters of this bill? Our soil is yet unstained with slavery; we are free, and surrounded with free soil; Iowa on the east is free. Kansas, on the south, is free, and is there danger on our northern and western borders? Sir, I too, like the gentleman from Burt, take issue with Mr. Buchanan. I believe that Congress has no power over the Territories upon this question. But I shall not vote for what is now uncalled for. This bill had its origin in Black Republican buncombe. As a Democrat, I shall not vote to honor their political caprices, and exercising common sense, I shall not vote to dispel a phantom. Sir, I vote 'no' upon this bill."

So far, so good. The bill was passed, and nothing was lacking but the signature of the Governor to give it the authority of law. But hardly had the vote been recorded, when the Democratic organs began to hint that it was the duty of the Governor to apply his negative to the "unnecessary piece of buncombe." Four or five days later the Democratic Governor of Nebraska, *vetoed the bill*. Gov. Black's reasons for withholding his signature, were substantially these:

"1st. The existence of Slavery in the Louisiana Territory, ceded to the United States, is recognized by the treaty of cession; hence, until the formation of a State out of the Territory so conveyed or any portion thereof, the abolition of Slavery is impossible without a violation of the treaty stipulations.

"2d. The equality of the States demands that the people of the States, as well as the people of the Free States may take their "property" to the Territory belonging to all States in common; hence the abolition of Slavery by a Territorial Legislature becomes impossible, because, by denying the citizens of the Slave States the right of migrating with their negroes, the equality of the States would be destroyed. In other words, *the Dred Scott decision which* Gov. Black *recognizes as in force forbids the Legislature to prohibit Slavery*."

So Slavery exists in Nebraska to-day in spite of the effort of the Legislature to abolish it! It is there, a fixed fact in the Territory, above and beyond the reach of Congress or of the people! As to the question whether Slavery does or does not exist in the Territory, it is in evidence, as a matter of public record, that a citizen of Page county, Iowa, a few weeks since, recovered damages in the amount of $8,000 from a gang of scoundrels who broke into his house while hunting for two negro girls, *held in Slavery in Nebraska*, who had "escaped from service or labor," a year and a half ago.

It may be added in this connection, that the legislature of *Kansas*, also, passed a bill last winter, abolishing Slavery in that Territory, and that the Democratic Governor, (Medary,) vetoed it!

CHAPTER IX.

ALL VOTES CAST FOR DOUGLAS ARE GIVEN PRACTICALLY TO BRECKINRIDGE OR JOE LANE.

When the Charleston Convention assembled, on the 23d of April, in the present year, it became apparent that Mr. Douglas had no strength in the Southern States. It was proclaimed with great volubility by his opponents, that while the delegates from the Republican States were all in favor of Douglas, the Democratic States were all against him. It is sufficient for our purpose that the Convention split on the Douglas issue, and that the delegates from South Carolina, Georgia, Florida, Alabama, Mississippi, Louisiana, Texas and a majority from Arkansas and Deleware seceded, and, after a brief session apart from the regular Convention, adjourned to meet at Richmond, on the 20th of June. The other Convention took fifty-seven ballots without making any nomination, and then adjourned to meet at Baltimore on the 18th of June, "to enable those States which were unrepresented to fill up their delegations." Well, the South Carolina Democratic State Committee called a new Convention, which met in due time at Columbia, and appointed a new set of delegates, instructing them *not to go to Baltimore at all*, but to meet at Richmond, pursuant to the Seceders' adjournment. The Georgia Democratic Executive Committee called a new Convention to meet at Milledgeville. Primary meetings were held in all the counties, and when the Convention assembled the vote stood 298 in favor of the Seceders, and 41 against them. The 298 thereupon re-appointed the old delegates to Baltimore, and the 41 withdrew and appointed a new set. The Florida Democratic State Committee called a new Convention, which met at Tallahasse, and did exactly what the South Carolina Convention had done. The Alabama Democratic State Committee called a new Convention to meet at Montgomery on the 4th day of June. Very soon after the call was issued, a number of private citizens, headed by John Forsyth, of Mobile, issued a sort of prospectus for a Convention to be held at Selma on the same day, to which "the Democracy and all other persons who were "willing to abide by the action of the Baltimore Convention and support its nominees," were invited to send delegates. Both Conventions met. The Democratic concern re-appointed the Seceders by a unanimous vote, and the Forsyth men elected a new delegation. The Mississippi Democratic State Committee called a new Convention which unanimously re-appointed the Seceders, and no other Convention was held. The Louisiana Democratic State Committee called a new Convention to meet at Baton Rouge, which unanimously re-appointed the Seceders. The Hon. Pierre Soule and a few others in New Orleans, however, called a mass meeting to assemble at Donaldsonville, which appointed a new set of delegates. The Texas Democracy re-appointed the Seceders without opposition. The Arkansas Democracy held a Convention and endorsed the Seceders, and the Delaware Democracy did the same. Thus the delegations were "filled up" in pursuance to the resolution adopted at Charleston. Seven weeks transpired between the adjournment at that place and the re-assembling at Baltimore. The delegates all visited their constituents; they all had opportunity to learn the wishes of those who gave them their commissions. Those who took part in the secession at Charleston had all been sent back by the regular organization of the party, except in two States which utterly refused to have anything more to do with "National Democracy," and dispatched their delegates to an antagonistic Convention at Richmond. Those who adhered to the remains of Democracy—those who "stuck to the ship," and talked of going down on the last timber—also had conferences, anxious and prolonged, no doubt, with their neighbors and constituents. They had abundant time to consider the question in all its phases. The question itself had been of such magnitude—had been so overmastering in its importance to the people, that no man who carried the vote of his district could fail to learn exactly what was desired of him and exactly what it would be safe or unsafe for him to do. The Convention met again at Baltimore on the 18th of June. Five days later it was rent in twain. Douglas was nominated by the delegates from Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, Rhode Island, Connecticut, a portion of New York, a portion of New Jersey, a portion of Pennsylvania, a portion of Maryland, Ohio, Indiana, Michigan, Illinois, Wisconsin, Iowa, a portion of Minnesota, and a portion of Missouri. John C. Breckinridge and Joseph Lane were nominated by the delegates from Delaware, Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, Florida, Alabama, Mississippi, Louisiana, Texas, Arkansas, Kentucky, Tennessee, California, Oregon, Massachusetts, a portion of Maryland, a portion of Missouri, a portion of Pennsylvania, a portion of Minnesota, and a small portion of New York. The Breckinridge and Lane Convention was presided over by the Hon. Caleb Cushing, the Chairman of the Charleston Convention. The question which arises here, is this: Did the delegates from the Southern States faithfully represent their constituents at Baltimore? If so, were they in earnest in nominating Breckinridge and Lane, or were they in fun? Are the Southern States going for Breckinridge and Lane, or for Douglas and Johnson? A few days ago, Mr. Johnson himself was hooted down at a public meeting, held at Macon, in his own State, and afterwards burned in effigy. He was not allowed

to make his speech at all, and it has since been published in the Atlanta *Confederacy* as the only means of reaching the public. (The *Confederacy*, by the way, is a Douglas paper, which goes strongly *for the re-opening of the African slave trade.*) In Delaware, there is to be no Douglas electoral ticket. In Virginia there are only six newspapers supporting Douglas, while there are over forty for Breckinridge and Lane. Mr. Roger A. Pryor, who ashered to Douglas up to the final split at Baltimore, has publicly announced himself for Breckinridge and Lane. In North Carolina it seems probable there will be no Douglas electoral ticket. In South Carolina, the electors are chosen by the Legislature, and nobody is for Douglas. In Florida, Alabama, Mississipp., Texas and Arkansas, there is next to nobody for him. The Democratic State Convention of Kentucky met a few days ago, and endorsed Breckinridge, with hardly a disseuting vote. In Tennessee, the few Douglasites that live in and around Memphis, have sold out body and breeches to Bell and Everett. In short, there is no Douglas party, which can properly be called a party, in any Southern State, except Missouri.

Now, if Mr. Douglas secures any electoral votes in the North, what is to be the result? The Electoral College consists of 303 votes. One hundred and fifty-two are required to elect a President. Deprived of Southern support, Douglas must carry almost the entire North to secure an election. Who believes that New England, New York, Ohio, Michigan, Wisconsin and Iowa, which went so overwhelmingly for Fremont, are now going for him? But if he succeeds in taking from Lincoln the votes of the Northern States which went for Buchanan, four years ago, he merely carries the election into the present House of Representatives, where he has only *one* vote, and where Breckinridge has *thirteen*. The Constitution of the United States, Article XII, *Amendments*, says:

"If no person have a majority of the whole number of Electors, then from the persons having the highest numbers, *not exceeding three*, on the list of those voted for as President, the House of Representatives shall choose immediately, by ballot, the President. But in choosing the President, the votes shall be taken by *states*, the representation from each state having *one vote*; a quorum for this purpose shall consist of a member or members from two-thirds of the states, and a majority of all the states shall be necessary to a choice. And if the House of Representatives shall not choose a President, whenever the right of choice shall devolve upon them, before the fourth day of March next following, then the Vice-President shall act as President, as in case of the death, or constitutional disability, of the President.

"The person having the greatest number of votes as Vice-President shall be the Vice-President, if such number be a majority of the whole number of Electors appointed; and if no person have a majority, then, from the *two highest* numbers on the list, the Senate shall choose the Vice-President; a quorum for the purpose shall consist of two-thirds of the whole number of Senators; a majority of the whole number shall be necessary to a choice."

Thus it appears that only the three highest candidates can be balloted for in the House, who in all human probability will be Lincoln, Breckinridge and Bell. But if we suppose that Mr. Douglas is one of the three highest, how will the case stand? Each State having one vote, the House would be divided as follows:

FOR LINCOLN.	FOR BRECKINRIDGE.
Maine,	Delaware,
New Hampshire,	Virginia,
Vermont,	South Carolina,
Massachusetts,	Georgia,
Rhode Island,	Florida,
Connecticut,	Alabama,
New York,	Mississippi,
New Jersey,	Louisiana,
Pennsylvania,	Texas,
Ohio,	Arkansas,
Indiana,	Missouri,
Michigan,	California,
Wisconsin,	Oregon——13.
Iowa,	
Minnesota——15.	
FOR DOUGLAS.	FOR BELL.
Illinois——1.	Tennessee——1.

EQUALLY DIVIDED.

Maryland, North Carolina, Kentucky——3.

The Maryland delegation in the House, consists of three Americans and three Democrats. The North Carolina delegation consists of four Americans and four Democrats. The Kentucky delegation consists of five Americans and five Democrats. Seventeen States being required to elect a President, Breckinridge will have to secure Maryland, North Carolina, Kentucky, and either Tennessee or Illinois, in addition to the thirteen which he has already. The Breckinridge faction believe that they can, without difficulty, get the votes of Mr. Webster, of Maryland, Mr. Vance, of North Carolina, Mr. Bristow or Mr. Mallory, or both, of Kentucky, and Messrs. Maynard, Brabson and Hatton, of Tennessee, when the pinch comes—which would give them all of these States, and elect their man. All of these South Americans are intensely pro-slavery, and it is calculated they would unhesitatingly vote for Breckinridge, if there was no chance for Bell. But if no election should be made by the House, prior to the 4th of March, 1861, the Breckinridge faction are *sure* of success in the Senate. The Constitution declares, that only the *two* highest candidates for Vice-President, shall be voted for there. These will inevitably be Lane and Hamlin. The Senate is divided as follows: Republicans 26; Breckinridge Democrats, 37; Americans, 1; Douglas, 1. (Mr. Pugh, of Ohio, leaves the Senate on the 4th of March, and Mr. Chase takes his seat; Mr. Crittenden, of Kentucky, leaves on the same day, and Mr. Breckinridge takes his seat; Mr. Lane, of Oregon, leaves on the same day, and his successor has not been elected.) Of course, Mr. Lane would be elected Vice-President on the first ballot, and he would then assume the functions of President of the United States, for four years. What sort of a figure then does Mr. Douglas cut in the three or four cornered fight? Simply that of a catspaw, to rake the chestnuts out of the fire for Breckinridge, or Joe Lane, his bitterest enemies! It was a special cruelty, almost a satanic ingenuity, on the part of those who nominated Breckinridge and Lane,

to so order the battle that *all the electoral votes carried for Douglas, should, in reality, play the game into their hands and not into his.* Are the honest supporters of "Popular Sovereignty," to be cheated in this way? Will they allow the election to go into the House, and thus insure the success of Breckinridge or Lane, by throwing away their votes on Douglas?

The following sharp article from the Buffalo *Commercial Advertiser*, of July 12th, the old and influential Fillmore organ, of Western New York, still further elucidates this question:

"We have the highest regard and respect for Gov. Hunt, and that gentleman will not misinterpret our motives or accuse us of undue personality, if we remind him of a business transaction with which he was once familiar. A gentleman, whom he knows very well, had built a boom across the Genesee river, at Mt. Morris, and profited by the spring freshet to float down several thousands of saw-logs. Other people relied upon the same boom; so many of them, in fact, that the boom went down. The logs of all parties were carried down the river, some of them fetching up in Lake Ontario. Mr. —— was making his arrangements to chase up his vagabond logs, when one day he received a call from a person who was a loser by the boom. Person was ready to make an arrangement: he had trusted the boom, and its insecure construction had occasioned him serious loss; *ergo*, Mr. —— should make him reparation. Whereupon, the following proposition was made: Mr. —— owned a tract of land in Scio; 18,000 acres; great many deer on it. He would give a deer for every saw-log; Mr. —— to take the logs where he could find them, the other party to do the same with the deer.

"Now it seems to us that the result of the late Union Convention, at Utica, is pretty much after the fashion of this proposition. The Union men agree to deliver to the Douglas men some 60,000 American saw-logs, running down stream like mad in a Republican freshet. The Douglas men pass over to the Union party something still more intangible, and if ever the Union leaders see anything more than the tail of that Douglas verision, we shall be astonished. We are tolerably well posted on the American vote of New York. It is recalcitrant, individualized, independent, knows no leaders, and now that the boom is broken, it will float off on the swift rolling tide of the Lincoln flood, beyond the reach of bargain and sale. Said a distinguished American—not Union—leader, a few days since, "I always found it easy enough to sell out the American vote: the trouble was to deliver."

"We take it for granted that Americans and old Whigs will shy off from this bargain, for the following very evident reasons: Douglas is as far from any resemblance to Americanism or Whigism as can well be conceived. Nothing can be gained for principle by electing him; and even the slavery issue will not be quieted. Douglas is the leading agitator of the question. He re-opened the quarrel after it had been satisfactorily closed by the compromise of 1850, and it would be queer policy now to look to the agitator as the source of quiet. Then again, they know perfectly well that even should the election go to the House, nothing can be done there as long as Bell has only one and Douglas one-of thirty-three votes, seventeen of which are required to elect. *And the House failing to elect, what can they expect of the Senate? The choice then would be between Lane and Hamlin, and Lane would win.*"

CHAPTER X.

"THE EVERLASTING NIGGER QUESTION."

Senator Douglas has been marking out for himself a departure from the dignified course of all the Presidential candidates we have ever had, by making a stumping tour in behalf of Douglas and Johnson. In his Boston speech, as we find it reported in the newspapers of that city, he said:

"For the last few years, the whole time of Congress has been employed in the discussion of the slavery question, to the exclusion of the important business affecting the whole country. (1.) Whenever you ask your representatives why they did not revise the revenue system, in order to defray the expenses of the government, without borrowing twenty millions of dollars a year, they will tell you they had not time. The whole time was occupied in the discussion of slavery, and there was no time to raise money to pay your honest debts. (2.) When you ask your representatives why it is that the Pacific Railroad has not been made, you were told that there was no time, because the Slavery question absorbed the entire session of Congress. (3.) When you ask your representatives why it is that the mail system has not been reformed and carried on with vigor throughout the country, you are told that the bill was lost for want of time. (4.) When you ask why it is that you have no overland mail route to the Pacific, and no steam lines, you are told that the slavery question occupied the whole session, and the bills were lost for want of time. (5.) Thus you find that all the great measures which affect the commercial interests, the shipping interests, the manufacturing interests, the industrial interests of the country, have been lost for want of time. (6.) My fellow-citizens, there never will be time to perform the duties for which the government was made, unless you banish forever the slavery question from the halls of Congress, and remand it to the people of each State and each Territory, according to the platform of the Democratic party."

Mr. Douglas makes haste to pronounce his own condemnation. His remarks constitute one of the best Republican arguments that has been put forth since the nomination of LINCOLN. We proceed to notice them in the order in which they are numbered above.

I. "Whenever you ask your representatives why they did not revise the revenue system in order to defray the expenses of the Government, without borrowing twenty millions of dollars a year, they tell you they had not time. The whole time was occupied in the discussion of slavery." At the last session of Congress the Republicans in the House of Representatives *did* revise the revenue system in order to defray the expenses of the Government without borrowing twenty millions of dollars a year, but *Senator Douglas* was too busy discussing the slavery question to give his influence or even his vote for the measure! The bill passed the House by a large majority, and was defeated by the Democrats in the Senate—by the opposition of some, and by the pre-occupation of others with the nigger question. Mr. Douglas was found in the latter category. He could "find no time" to attend to the revenue system.

II. "When you ask your representatives why it is that the Pacific Railroad has not been made, you were told that there was no time, because the slavery question had absorbed the entire session of Congress." The Republicans in the House of Representatives did essay, earnestly and manfully, to pass a Pacific Railroad bill at the last session of Congress. They were thwarted at every point by the Democracy, some of whom were Mr.

Douglas' peculiar friends! Did Douglas himself display any zeal for the measure? No. He was too busy discussing Sedition Laws and the various phases of the slavery question.

III. "When you ask your representatives why it is that your mail system has not been reformed and carried on with vigor throughout the country, you are told that the bill was lost for want of time." "The bill" which Mr. Douglas talks of was prepared and carried through the House of Representatives by the Republicans, *in opposition to the votes of the five Douglas members from Illinois!* Mr. Douglas was too much occupied discussing the slavery question to give it any assistance, and all his friends voted squarely against it. It was finally defeated by Democratic votes in the Senate—Douglas himself not voting for it at all! He was doubtless preparing a new speech or magazine article on the "everlasting nigger question."

IV. "When you ask why it is that you have no overland mail route to the Pacific, and no steam lines, you are told that the slavery question occupied the whole session, and that the bills were lost for want of time." Both measures were carried through the House by the Republicans, and were defeated by the Democracy in the Senate. Mr. Douglas was so busy discussing the slavery question.

V. "Thus you find that all the great measures which affect the commercial interests, the shipping interests, the manufacturing interests, the industrial interests of the country, have been lost for want of time." This is rather the coolest thing of all. A single debate on the slavery question, initiated by Mr. Douglas on the 22d of February, and mainly carried on by himself, filled forty columns of the *Globe*. Another speech of his in May occupied two days in delivery. Another (on the Sedition Law) consumed the better part of two different days. Another (his wanton and disreputable attack on Senator Seward) filled six or eight columns of the *Globe*. In short, he occupied about three times as much of the public attention in discussing the slavery question during the last session of Congress as any other member!

VI. "My fellow citizens, there never will be time to perform the duties for which the government was made, unless you banish forever the slavery question from the halls of Congress, and remand it to the people of each State and each Territory according to the platform of the Democratic party." In 1852 the platform of the Democratic party declared that they would "resist all attempts at renewing, in Congress or out of it, the agitation of the slavery question, under whatever shape or color the attempt may be made." One year and a half after the adoption of the platform, this Douglas set about repealing the Missouri Compromise, and by that act laid the foundation of all the slavery agitation which has since followed. Was there ever impudence like this, which he now puts on before the good people of Boston? Where else is it to be found?

CHAPTER XI.

LINCOLN'S AND HAMLIN'S LETTERS OF ACCEPTANCE.

SPRINGFIELD, Ill., May 23, 1860.

Hon. George Ashmun, President of the Republican National Convention:

SIR:—I accept the nomination tendered me by the Convention over which you presided, and of which I am formally apprised, in the letter of yourself and others acting as a Committee of the Convention for that purpose. The declaration of principles and sentiments, which accompanies your letter, meets my approval, and it shall be my care not to violate it or disregard it in any part. Imploring the assistance of Divine Providence, and with due regard to the views and feelings of all who were represented in the Convention; to the rights of all the States and Territories and the people of the nation; to the inviolability of the Constitution and the perpetual union, harmony and prosperity of all, I am most happy to co-operate for the practical success of the principles declared by the Convention.

Your obliged friend and fellow citizen,

ABRAHAM LINCOLN.

WASHINGTON, May 30, 1860.

GENTLEMEN:—Your official communication of the 18th inst., informing me that the Representatives of the Republican party of the United States, assembled at Chicago on that day, had, by unanimous vote, selected me as their candidate for the office of Vice-President of the United States, has been received, together with the resolutions adopted by the Convention as its declaration of principles. Those resolutions enunciate clearly and forcibly the principles which unite us, and the objects proposed to be accomplished. They address themselves to all, and there is neither necessity nor propriety in my entering upon a discussion of any of them. They have the approval of my judgment, and in any action of mine will be faithfully and cordially sustained. I am profoundly grateful to those with whom it is my pride and pleasure politically to co operate, for the nomination so unexpectedly conferred, and I desire to tender through you to the members of the Convention my sincere thanks for the confidence thus reposed in me. Should the nomination which I now accept be ratified by the people, and the duties devolve upon me of presiding over the Senate of the United States, it will be my earnest endeavor faithfully to discharge them, with a just regard for the rights of all. It is to be observed, in connection with the doings of the Republican Convention, that a paramount object with us is to preserve the normal condition of our Territorial domain as homes for free men. The able advocate and defender of Republican principles whom you have nominated for the highest place that can gratify the ambition of man, comes from a State which has been made what it is by the special action in that respect of the wise and good men, who founded our institutions. The rights of free labor have there been vindicated and maintained. The thrift and enterprise which so distinguished Illinois as one of the most flourishing States of the glorious West, we would see secured to all the Territories of the Union and restore peace and harmony to the whole country by bringing back the Government to what it was under the wise and patriotic men who created it. If the Republicans shall succeed in that object, as they hope to, they will be held in garteful remembrance by the busy and teeming millions of future ages.

I am, very truly yours,

H. HAMLIN.

To Hon. G. ASHMUN, Pres't, &c.